

Shock And Awe - The Manipulation Of The Human Psyche

by Alan Watt

Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt 2009 (Exempting Literary Quotes)

cuttingthroughthematrix.com

alternate sites:

cuttingthroughthematrix.net , .us , .ca

alanwattcuttingthroughthematrix.ca

European site includes all audios & downloadable TRANSCRIPTS in European languages for print up:

alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

mirror site:

cuttingthrough.jenkness.com

Information for purchasing Alan's books, CDs, DVDs and DONATIONS:

Canada and America: PayPal, Cash, personal checks &
for the US, **INTERNATIONAL** postal money orders / for Canada, **INTERNAL** postal money orders
(America: Postal Money orders - Stress the **INTERNATIONAL** pink one, not the green internal one.)

Outside the Americas: PayPal, Cash, Western Union and Money Gram
(Money Gram is cheaper; even cheaper is a Money Gram check - in Canadian dollars: mail via the postal services worldwide.)

PayPal Orders: USE THE [DONATE](#) BUTTON ON THE WEBSITE - AND -
Send a separate email along with the donation (list your order, name and address)

Click the link below for your location (ordering info):

[USA](#)

[Canada](#)

[Europe/Scandinavian](#)

[All Other Countries](#)

Alan Watt: I'm Alan Watt and I've been following politics and geopolitics for a good part of my life. I didn't start off deliberately going out to find out everything that was possibly going on. In fact I had no idea to be honest with you how vast the scale of an agenda, a political agenda is when you're bringing in a global society.

Wars have many different purposes; economics is only simply one big part of it, but culture change and the building of Empire through the defeated Nations joining in Leagues. Every country was basically signing the same laws - and had been my whole life, at the same time - that affected their societies. Laws were introduced and bills were introduced, unbeknownst to the people in those countries that it was being introduced in their neighboring countries or even across the water somewhere at the same time.

I realized there was already governmental control obviously, that coordinated all of this, and it led me into the United Nations. For every single department of government you have on a federal, local, county, state, provincial level, the United Nations had an equivalent department to deal with everything. It was already set up in fact to be global government. H.G. Wells said at the League of Nations - which was the embryo for the United Nations - he said this is the nucleus of the world government.

When eventually all laws will come from there, be passed and signed into law by treaty of all the member countries, eventually we won't even have to go through the farce - and that's what it is - of voting in parties or candidates. Because in the latter part of the 20th century and now into the 21st century we're being trained, rather obviously, to simply accept rule by experts, rule by scientists, rule by professionals. And that's what they mean when they call government 'governance' - that's the term used.

How do you get a domesticated herd to move from a field - a system in which it's been grazing for twenty, fifty years, this kind of system - to this field over here, this new field? Because we're reluctant, we have reluctance to change. We like familiarity, we like routine you see. You do it by various techniques, one of which is revolution. Most revolutions are bloodless; you have cultural revolutions, sexual revolutions - along with that comes the music revolutions etc. These literally are designed to alter and direct culture, knowing what kind of culture they'll have at the very end of it too. They know exactly what kind of culture they want to come out of it.

You can also do it through crisis creation; crisis after crisis has been hit on the people of the world since 9/11 happened, and we must understand that the techniques that are used abroad are also used at home in warfare. And we heard the term "shock and awe"; shock and awe on the hard - the hard force level as they call it - is bombs, all kinds of acoustic equipment to nullify enemies, scare the hell out of them through voice-to-skull and so on, which was used in Gulf War 1 and it was all over the British media.

But you can also use shock and awe on your domestic people again; you do it by crisis after crisis until the public are so terrified. You see the average person has a sort of confidence that they build up, where they think "I can manage most things that come my way. Whatever little crisis in my life, what happens to other people, I can deal with." When all those around you are getting scared at the same time as you because they're losing their jobs, they're being threatened with pandemics, terrorists everywhere, terrifying people to even get on subways and so on, and all those around you are also in the same boat, you tend to be more easily directed by the powers-that-be that come out and speak with authority and confidence over you. That's why they give you a guy like Obama, who's trained in oratory. He was trained in oratory - not

in truth, but in oratory; the technique of persuasion.

Shock and awe, as I say, is a technique of making a person and a whole population punch-drunk. And each one of those fears - you understand the average person can handle one major crisis in their personal life, maybe two at the same time. It's understood in psychology and many many studies that if you have maybe three to four crises hitting you personally in your life at the same time, you will literally go into an incredible depression, a reactive depression. You can't cope. That's understood. Apply that technique on a whole population.

The thing is, there's not one of these crises that we're being told about that you personally can do anything about. What can you do about terrorism, if it really exists all over the place? It's out of your hands, you're helpless. What can you do about a coming pandemic? It's out of your hands, you're helpless. What can you do about a nuke getting set off in New York Harbor or wherever? You can't, you're helpless. The message you're getting is that you're utterly helpless to defend, help, or save yourself. That is complete shock and awe tactic that's been used, not only in the U.S. and Canada, but across the world - same strategy, because we're already global with a global society running us all. Massive psychology and warfare techniques in psychology is being used across the planet to make us succumb to fear and crisis, none of which we can actually do anything about on an individual level.

Therefore the leaders are presented to us onscreen, with uniforms or business suits and ties as politicians who speak with confidence - all scripted of course - and they seem to have everything under control. You're now basically a fearful slave looking up to the powerful master to defend and protect you. That's the simple technique of it.

I've been speaking about the Rockefeller Foundation. I was mentioning the fact that in the United States the Rockefeller Foundation which also runs, I think it is the Carnegie Foundation today, maybe even the Ford, they're all combined; the families that are given the intergenerational rights if you like, or authority, to lead the world to amalgamation under global governance. Mr. Rockefeller also is heavily involved in the world depopulation strategies; he funds abortion clinics across the planet. He also funds hundreds of other front foundations that you would think were independent from his, but they're actually front foundations. He funds them all through his money. You can trace them all back again to so-called "family planning" clinics across the entire globe, especially in the third world countries.

It seems that Mr. Rockefeller is intensely worried about overpopulation in the near future, from countries which will have no industry etc. and he sees it as his right to start the decimating process basically, of depopulation. Last winter I got an invitation to attend something called the World Citizenship Council, the annual meeting. That kind of floored me because the head of the World Citizenship Council is Mr. Rockefeller himself, and here I am speaking out about and against them. So this did not come out of the blue, they try and get you on board working for them. What was also more startling was they always give members maybe 15 minutes or 20 minutes to speak, and I was offered that to speak on stage to this world meeting.

The World Citizenship idea is part of the old idea of Cecil Rhodes, up into Lord Milner, to the Royal Institute of International Affairs and the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Rockefeller is up on Google in some of his conferences giving out World Citizenship awards to very famous people. So they already bypass and have bypassed sovereign nations a long time ago. What other benefits you get from being a world citizen I'm not certain at all. But he said I would be allowed to speak at this conference. He did not say what to speak about, or didn't say anything on what not to speak about. And he also said - this chairman of course, who wrote to me - he also said that I'd be allowed to participate in the Round Table groups which come after.

The Round Table Society is very very important because the Round Table societies were set up as far back as the Milner Society and the Rhodes Foundation; they came out with the first Round Table societies. What they do is take the topics that are discussed at the main meetings, then they split off at different tables to specialize in certain aspects of the speeches they've heard and find ways how to implement them into reality through media promotion, various methods of propaganda and so on.

I did not attend. I was tempted to go just to see if they would ask me not to speak about certain things, but it was the middle of winter and the journey to this university would have been pretty hectic anyway, and I was so busy. But you will be approached and that's not the first time I've been approached to do this kind of thing. You'll find that some people are bought over. I should go back to Lord Bertrand Russell on this topic because Lord Bertrand Russell said in one of his own books, the same book in fact where he talks about those children who manage to escape the indoctrinations - who have intelligence and an ability to communicate to others - must be brought on board the system, employed by the system, bribed into the system if possible; that generally works with most people. He said otherwise we shall have to eliminate them, because they did not want people around who understood an agenda that the general public are unaware of, didn't want these people with the ability to communicate information, documented information, in a fashion that people will understand, out in the community where they could spread this word.

That ties in with Mao Tse-Tung who said he was not afraid of armies - his worst fear was someone with a good idea, a great idea, a unique idea, and the ability to communicate it. So *that* is how they treat, basically, people with information. First comes the invitation to join them. Many people do - as I say Bertrand Russell backed that up by saying if they can't be brought on board they must be literally eliminated from the public arena. That's how seriously they take this agenda at the top. They don't mess around.

The reason I think they don't simply come out and kill you, straightforward, is they don't have to do a messy job - there's many ways of killing you, especially in this day and age. But I think to be honest they're so arrogant right now at this moment, they're not too worried about the mass of the general population who *are* indoctrinated and updated with their indoctrination daily from television, as one example.

About a hundred years ago this big organization with many branches that wanted to rule the world basically, using Britain as a nucleus of a system, an embryo which was also going to be joined with the U.S. under the Anglo-American Establishment, wrote about the kind of culture and the changes of culture over a hundred year period that they would actually design.

We're all tribal to an extent; that's why we even bother to vote for a tribal leader. This is well understood; that's why we're supplied with these leaders. And because the average man was to become more disengaged from his own destiny as the expert class arose, it was decided that the males would get their outlet basically, gradually becoming helpless as males, through sports. Therefore they'd have a tribal team they could identify with; they could cheer them on as though they were winning. In their own personal lives they were getting nowhere. They were getting disenfranchised in a sense, as experts took over decision-making for them in all kinds of fields. So this was psychology at use, planned before they even implemented the sports. When radio came along, of course they used that to the maximum; sports for the men, radio soaps basically for the women. And then in came television with its alpha state, its hypnotic state. It took off. It really really took off and men became glued to the sports shows.

The big think tanks – and we've had think tanks to do with always planning the future and how they would create societies and even different cultures between, within a hundred years say from this type of society to that society to the next society, how they'd implement it. Again, always through the youth culture which is easy to do if you have universal education. You can always mandate the same system, same culture to be taught to the youth. However, as I say since the 1960s once television really really took off, sports used to only come out on Saturdays, and over a ten year period it gradually came on every night of the week, until today we have even sports channels; sports, sports, sports.

And you see guys who are sitting at home, who are basically powerless at work; they have bosses, they're powerless on the road, there's police and traffic wardens and cops watching them – they have no means to feel strong. And so they tend to watch sports as a substitute. They project themselves into a game which they never participate in. As long as their team wins they feel something's happening in their life that's positive, and it's successful. It's a very good substitute for many many things as far as the elite are concerned.

Now, the big think tanks that involved many professional people knew that they'd have to give something that's for the males and for the woman they'd also give a substitute too. The intention being, ultimately, to alter society; drastically alter it so much that even the purpose of marriage, for instance, would lose any appeal. For the females they gave them high fashion – accessible prices for high fashion, clothes.

People don't realize they brought in the miniskirt back in the 1920s, during prohibition. They brought in cocaine at the same time along with the booze, to get young people in. The idea being that if you were doing something illegal, it's very naughty; youngsters love to break the rules, get together, we're all being naughty together. And sex and booze – coupled with coke being smuggled in at that time – had its desired effects, but not quite the way it was designed to have by those who planned that culture; the Bernays types. And [Edward] Bernays was heavily involved in this.

So they came out, as I say, with not sex and rock and roll, but sex and a form of jazz. The Charleston dance came in, the miniskirt came in, sex became rather rampant for the first time; all the old traditional taboos were broken with one generation. But there was fallout to this change, this massive change in culture. The fallout being that they did not have the antibiotics to treat all the sexually transmitted disease that came along. Secondly, they didn't have the legal abortion clinics to take care of the unwanted children that also were produced by hyper-promiscuity. They opened up big orphanages to try and take care of this; the Boys Towns. They had ones for girls too.

But there was so much backlash – especially in the United States from the old Christian communities – that they had to tone it all down. It kind of flopped. Sexually transmitted disease became rampant, so did unwanted pregnancies and abortions. And so they went back to the drawing board because remember, before this all happened the big players – the new high priesthood we'll call them, of the time lords; those who create the future, work in think tanks for the big establishment – had a definite mandate. The only problem was: how do you achieve that mandate over a time period? So they went back to the drawing board. And they've always known for instance that in wartime more children are produced because people – young people who might go off to die tomorrow – tend to be far more promiscuous.

They brought this back after World War II big time. They worked on it steadily. All our tax money went into one particular area of research – not just the atomic weaponry and so on – it went into finding ways of finding a contraceptive that was effective. When they found it they launched it on the scene at the same time as they launched what they called "pop music", along with drugs, LSD and so on. They brought out the contraceptive, so then permission was given in a sense, and promoted from the top down – even from the BBC.

Remember, the BBC is owned by the British government; it's an arm of the British government. It talks on behalf of the dominant minority who rule Britain. So *they* began to promote all this stuff. All the DJs they'd bring on television would interview the top pop stars of the day. They were all stoned out of their minds, some of them were falling out of chairs, and the interviewers would say "tee hee, aren't we naughty children." All aimed at a young generation to emulate. This is what we do; monkey see, monkey do.

Once again, remember the prime intent was to break the old culture of boy meets girl, going together for a while, getting engaged, getting married, having children. The family unit, they'd said when they had the League of Nations – which was the precursor of the United Nations – said they'd have to destroy the family unit.

Pretty well all of H.G. Wells' non-fiction books promote all of this agenda. And in fact he coined the term in the late 1800s – this is how far back this agenda for promiscuity had to go – he coined the term "free love". In one of his books, written before 1890, he says we must promote free love in order to destroy and end the obsolete family unit. Once that's done, he said the family is no longer in the way when government comes for an individual. Each individual will be solely responsible to the government itself and no family will stand up around them like a primitive tribe and defend them.

At the same time the foundations within the United States and Britain and elsewhere were funding what appeared to be

far left groups; communist groups. So much so that the Reece Commission went in to look into this from the '50s to find out why top capitalists – who owned international corporations and banks, international banks – were putting up foundations to fund far left groups. Well we know now that it was to literally destroy the old culture in order to bring in the new culture, the new society.

So therefore you have the proliferation of sexual activity. The fallout still came from unwanted pregnancies, far reduced than it had been before because of contraception. But then came the lead of the feminist charge – again, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation in the States – to spearhead and demonstrate and demand the rights for abortion. If they could get the public to devalue human life – and that's in the writings of Julian Huxley; he says if we can get society to devalue human life and take humanity off its pedestal as a supreme being on the planet, then, he said, we can bring in our controlled society with a workable population.

Everything works within culture towards an agenda. And as Plato said so long ago – over 2,300 years ago – he said culture and cultural changes must be authorized from the top. If it's grassroots, truly grassroots, then it's outside of the elite's control and ripple effects could occur and it could spread anywhere; they couldn't control it, contain it anymore. Therefore the major changes in culture – which Plato said came through drama and the emulation of actors, actresses, including fashions that they wore, and the music they heard – had to be strictly regulated and authorized from the top.

The whole science of this – which was always a science, and understood by those in those businesses – was used to the maximum to literally drastically alter culture so radically in the '60s and '70s that they could never return to a past way of living. We tie that in with another big player; Lord Bertrand Russell, who had experimental schools under royal charter, where he could do things that anyone else would be locked up for doing. He said in his own schools – and they were mixed schools – he said that if you could encourage pre-pubertal sexuality amongst the children, encourage multiple partners, from before puberty, he says the chances – because of study and observation – the chances of them ever bonding with one person for the rest of their life was pretty well obsolete, null and void, wouldn't happen.

Therefore that technique all came into play during the '60s. It was called free love. Drugs helped it along the way. And that was the beginning of what we saw as short-term relationships. Divorces become more and more common. Interestingly enough, divorces really took off not because society demanded it, or it came from a need or demand from the people; divorces took off because of the Hollywood stars. Now remember too, the drama industry, the entertainment industry have always said this; the people follow the stars. And they're the guiding stars in the so-called occult, you see.

We tend to worship wealth and people, and famous people. We want to be like them, we want to identify with them. The whole idea of divorces came out from Hollywood, with the top stars leading the charge for this. Women started to talk about it; who was getting divorced, what actress from what guy and so on, and gradually it put the idea across to them that well if they're getting divorced, then maybe so should I.

At the same time the Bernays techniques were used through all kinds of magazines. At that time 97% of all magazine publications were aimed at women, because advertisers have said – and it's still taught in marketing schools today – woman are far more easy to get to go along with something new than males are. So within all these magazines and write-ups about their famous actresses, their heroines and so on, the rich ones, the average women were reading these stories and identifying with them. They were being told that you can do anything, you can have it all; you could have a career, you can have a family, have a home. They gave them utter lies, and they coined the term 'superwoman'.

So across the whole of Europe and the States, and Canada at the same time – always coordinated at the same time – the media and entertainment industry were promoting stories of superwomen and they'd find someone real or imaginary, we'll never know, who supposedly was a CEO of a company, who had all these children at home, had a great husband, could manage everything, and could cook great cuisine, blah, blah. And that, of course, is a fantasy. This put pressure on most women, to try and live up to the fantasy, as all advertising does.

And most of the stuff we're getting is advertising, or at the very least it's basic psychological manipulation; Bernays techniques again. Remember too that he called it the creation of a consumer society; well behaved people – as long as there's money going around, they would go into the material world and they would forgo having children. That's the same thing as Charles Galton Darwin talked about; if we can encourage the woman and the male to go after the material benefits of the world, there's a slimmer chance they'll actually have children, who tend to be economically burdensome.

People were addicted to television in a very short space of time. Most people still today think that all entertainment to do with movies and drama is there for nothing more than their entertainment. It never ever was that case. The greatest social messages are promoted through movies and drama, high drama, through the fixation of emotive sequences, emotional sequences. Not logical, factual sequences, but pushing points across in an emotional way which register and fix in the mind – so emotional content is very very important, rather than going through an actual discussion or an argument using logic and facts. There's no debate. And when you're being downloaded through fiction, your guard is down. The censor part of your brain is not in action, as it would be in a debate or a lecture; you're actually in an alpha state being completely downloaded with new ideas, very similar to a computer.

And so therefore a culture industry, which is called by its own "the culture industry" – the Soviet Union had a department called the culture industry. Their actors and directors were called the cultural leaders. All you have to do is keep giving them new updates every so often, and you can change an entire country or a nation or a bloc of nations, who are all getting the same uploads, upgrades at the same time, along certain paths. Today we call it political correctness.

Most people want to belong to their peer group. They want to be the same as everyone else when it comes to opinions. In fact, they judge their own personal sanity by bouncing ideas off their neighbours and friends, who will answer back and agree on these same topics in kind. It doesn't matter if the topics or what you're given are facts or utter nonsense, as long as everyone agrees at the same time – you'll say "well I'm sane" and your friends will all agree because they've had the same information given to them.

We don't only get the same information given to us; we're led through sequences – even by documentaries – to leave you

with a predetermined fixed conclusion, on any given topic. Most folk are, once again, unaware of this; they think "I've just been given all the facts on this topic and this is the obvious conclusion" which is always given to you by the final experts on the particular program. There's no thinking involved.

We tie this in with [Zbigniew] Brzezinski: Brzezinski said in his book *Between Two Ages* - now this guy was way up with the NSA, he's a master geopolitician, he admits that he works in 20, 50 year periods to do with geopolitics in other countries - he said himself the public will shortly be unable to think or reason for themselves. He was meaning by the form of information that was given to them, the type, the formulas that were in use then in the 1970s. And eventually, he said, they will expect the media to do all their thinking and reasoning for them. Well that's happened today. That's why people today can't think outside of their programming from television.

To give an instance in fact of why TV was so important, to show you that it was so important to have it in the homes of ordinary people; most countries in Europe for instance up into the 1950s and '60s - and I'll give an example as Britain - the working class people did not have credit cards. You could not get a credit card. You couldn't get a bank loan without collateral, to put something up against it. So therefore you were at pretty well a fixed income; there was no extra cash outside of rent, food and so on, clothes for the children, essentials. There were no extras for luxuries. There was no credit given to them, yet the British government - just like the Chinese government did two years ago - made it a mandate that every household in Britain must get a television set. And what they did, they made one exception - out of all the things that the people could need, really needed, they made one exception - they allowed credit companies to come into being. They could go round the houses every week and collect half a crown, or five shillings or whatever it was, and pay off a used television set.

The British government made a deal with the United States of America to buy in used televisions, which were then reconditioned, to be sold to the working class all across Britain. As I say, they wanted a TV in every home. Now since when is government interested in how happy you are at home? You know, there's another reason for this. And sure enough the working classes all got these DER - DER was the company that brought them all into Britain - and the guys came round every weekend collecting their half a crown, five shillings.

And suddenly - and I can remember where I was, it was one of the last areas really to get television; a real working class area - I can remember at this high [height] being taken by my parents to the local park on a weekend, and passing dozens and dozens and dozens of other couples on the way with their toddlers as well. When you got to the park which was a valley, there were over maybe a thousand, a thousand and a half couples along the grass in the valley. And that's where everything was discussed; local politics, national politics, labor unions to do with their mining and so on. And everyone mingled with everyone else, old school friends and so on. That system had been going on for hundreds of years - hundreds of years, where people communicated thoughts, real feelings, real things that really mattered to them and their communities to each other; conversation. When the TV came in, and I was still about this high, within about a month I could go down that park every weekend and no one - I mean no one - was there. It literally overnight killed off the socialization and interaction between people, and tradition, again where they exchanged viewpoints, gave each other news, helped each other out, who was sick, who was this, who was that, everyone helped each other out.

From then on you could pass rows and rows and rows of these houses - and they were called row houses, all joined together - and all you saw at night was the flickering of that bluish light in the windows, and that was the end. That was the end of real communities. It happened within a matter of about a month.

The flicker rate on the television is very very important. It was timed to be so many cycles per second, and it actually just meets with the brain patterns for an alpha state. When our brain sees it through our eyes, we start to adopt that flicker rate in our mind and we go into a deep alpha state. Watch children, and watch their mouths; they drop open. They won't hear their parents talking. They're hypnotized in fact.

Why would they give you that particular flicker rate, when they could have chosen out of a whole variety of flicker rates? It wasn't an essential thing to have, so it was done for a purpose; it was meant to be hypnotic. It was meant to be used a tool of propaganda and indoctrination, even through the guise of entertainment and so on. It was also to create a new society, because they were the avant-garde, as I say, leading the sexual revolution, through drama, through little documentaries, fiction, non-fiction, all combined.

Once again back to Plato, the audience sees what they see. You have to understand that it's even worked out towards different age groups, there's something on for everybody, everybody's age group; each age group is actually being updated as well - even the elderly ones - into new ways of thinking, or seeing things. But the target mainly was for youngsters.

If we take one of the world's experts on propaganda who is Jacques Ellul, who wrote extensively on how the mind works and how *all* entertainment, he said, that has to do with government programs such as police, detective stories, detective series, which contain little human dramas as the hook that you identify with, to make you watch the whole story; child gets kidnapped, detective goes on a hunt, he goes through hell and fire to get that child back. You identify with the hero if you're a male, you'll identify with the heroine if you're a female - and that's the hook to get you to watch them. What he said was all dramas to do with police or even the military, in movies, are *pure* propaganda; pure propaganda.

The human story is just the bait to make you watch through it, to get you to identify with it. Because once again, there's always a message left somewhere in the movie. It might even be a message that's against your own morality. It could be where the cop for instance, does sleep with this beautiful woman, while his wife is at home, and it's all part of the story. And they even tell you why he did this; he was feeling down that day, blah, blah, blah. And so you've just again altered your viewpoints on how you yourself might behave in that situation, and that sometimes that kind of thing can be justified. That's how you're downloaded through entertainment. It's there to alter and direct, and always upgrade into another step of the direction that the entire culture moves, for someone else's purpose.

Let's talk about the effects of the alpha state first of all. Recent articles I've even read on the air, from various science studies, show you that even when you switch off television you remain in that alpha state for maybe 45 minutes to an hour,

sometimes longer, depending how long you've been watching it. With high definition, again, why would a president of a country mandate that all TVs have to go high definition? Is it because he really cares so much about your happiness, and he wants better quality for you? Or is there another reason for it? Well I'm sure the effects of the old flicker rate and what it did will also be incorporated in high definition, but with even more added benefits for bringing you into a complete hypnotic state.

How do you wake someone up who is addicted to television? You can't - very very simple. You can't get your daily brainwashing - where literally it's bypassing any consciousness in the person - you can't take that every day and still try to wake up and learn at the same time. I've known people who have gone through complete withdrawal from television and gone into depressions, because their entire routine is broken. They also have time on their hands, which is a big aspect of control, remember too; if you can take time away from a person who can think for themselves, who might say "I'll go and read a book, I'll go and study something", if you can take that time away from them and have them mesmerized in front of a television set, then you'll keep them dumb, stupid, compliant and going along with the system.

I always advise to people, if you know someone who is watching TV it's quite simple to find out where they are mentally, psychologically in the understanding of things; you can ask them a few simple questions. If they give you standard television answers forget it - simple as that; forget it. If you see some spark of their own opinion coming in, there's maybe a chance you can do something with them.

You see television can be classified as a drug. Any addiction is still an addiction. Television is an addiction; people watch four, five hours per day. Top psychologists, and even the United Nations, have talked about the use of television for creating the new culture for children. How many people know that all government agencies - or departments, all governments in the world basically - have departments of culture which hire cartoonists - and pay their expenses - to do cartoons, always incorporating the latest political correct story to do with the environment, waste, bad adults and how they've destroyed the planet through their consuming etc.? How many people realize, as you plunk your children down in front of it to baby-sit them, that they're actually being brainwashed, scientifically? And these cartoons were designed by experts, to get their message across to those children, implanted in their young minds, fixed in their young minds forever, for the rest of their lives, ongoing daily. And even right down to the novels that you read the children, that are designed for children too, which will incorporate all of this - all paid by government grants to authors and writers. You literally have to take it into your own hands. It's one of the most dangerous tools that can be used.

It's also dangerous in this extent: why do you think government licenses TV stations? If you were an independent producer, TV station, who came out with this kind of information, you would not get a license. You would have to be authorized and politically correct, with a whole bunch of things to do and not to do written out before you'd be given a license. And you'd be checked on every so often to make sure you were following those topics that you were allowed to.

If you want to advise people on television - and you can do this with yourself, how to train yourself how to watch television - you never get involved; you understand a storyline, you watch a movie but don't get involved in, as I say, there's always a thread or a hook for you to follow, a plot, whatever, the chase; the guy always ends up with the beautiful woman at the end after going through hell to rescue a child, or save the world or whatever it happens to be. If you can stop yourself from getting lost in the emotional part of it, and study the movie as you're watching it, you'll learn the techniques that have been implanted in the movie itself. That's a great way to learn. If you do it with yourself, you can also show other people how to do this, to actually study everything as it's being presented to you. And eventually what you'll find is that when you're watching even documentaries, you'll see how the documentaries themselves are shaped to give you the opinions (often very strong opinions) without giving you specific facts, or giving you distorted facts etc. Learn how to critically analyze and think as you're watching.

And if you can show others this technique; a good example is to sit down with someone who regularly watches a good movie - one that you've previously watched - and then point out all the politically correct, little inserted words, slogans, phrases that have been put in there and show them, show them how it's been done. That way it can actually be fun to study television. And write down all the different things that they've missed. But it's all implanted subconsciously in their mind, because those implants - those subconscious implants - will become their opinions and they will never know how they arrived at them. They won't remember it's from this particular documentary, this particular movie or whatever. So that can also be fun. That's a positive side of it; you can train anyone to do this.

With the internet, the first person to mention it that I know of - at least to the public - was again this master Brzezinski in his book *Between Two Ages*. In the early '70s he said shortly a system will be given to the public, of mass communication, which will cause a revolution; it'll be a revolutionary thing to change society. But he also mentioned and hinted at the fact that there would be regulation behind it. He mentioned too that those who brought it in would never lose control, the main control over the internet, because after all knowledge is power. Knowledge has always been power - that's why all down through the ages the real machinations of government are never told to the public; real power comes from understanding and having *all* the facts on any particular topic.

So therefore the internet was to be given to the general public with other intentions. Initially it was to get them all into it. Now, what did the elite want to achieve? What was their point of view? They wanted people to become so used to the internet that they couldn't do without it. Now we see businesses really can't do without it; they can't imagine going back to pencil and paper and taking inventory, and all this kind of stuff. For the youngsters, who must be the generation they target, they made sure that - it's the only thing I knew about the internet, from the media, I was completely ignorant about it, and computers - the only thing I knew was there was lots of pornography on it. Every paper kept telling you about it, which again is the same old technique they used in the '60s and '70s - aren't we naughty, wink wink, for the rock stars on television - knowing all the youngsters would get into it when their hormones are high; that's all they're thinking about. But once folk were addicted to it, they also planned to gradually alter it, keeping the people addicted to it as they changed it into another system where mainstream media - the authorized media, the culture creation industry media - would eventually have prime, or the main dubs; the first grabs at the main bandwidth that eventually they're claiming will have to be reduced.

So in the meantime, there's never been a window of opportunity for the general public to use a medium to communicate to

each other alternate news, verified facts to each other, as we have at the moment. That eventually, supposedly, is going to be policed. They've had international meetings, the first one held in Canada – under the auspices of the United Nations – to do with regulating and censorship of the internet. They have these meetings every year as they add more laws to it. We know the Cloud system is to come in eventually – it's been all over the media in Britain – where you won't be able to store anything on a hard drive; you want even need a hard drive eventually. Remote servers will have all *your* information for you. It will then be used as a form of punishment; if you were politically incorrect in some form or another, then you'll be cut off from accessing that sever with all your data, until you toe the line and behave yourself.

Social control can be used through money, monetary penalizations, or through other penalizations like withdrawing your access from it. It definitely will be used for social control again, unless there's a backlash from the general public. And they do expect backlashes from people who have become used to looking into whatever site they wish to look at, or communicating whatever kind of information they want to, to each other.

Now, along with the introduction of the internet we've got to remember too, the government agencies also set up and promoted chat rooms and all the rest of it, and there are agents within this strange nether region called the internet, whose job it is to infiltrate people who are coming together as groups, communicating on specific topics to do with political changes, and disrupting those groups. So already it's a battlefield – and they called it “the cyber wars” long before they even gave this internet to the people. It would be an informational war they said, in all the papers, therefore government intelligence agencies would have to expand their roles with mandates to also be in this invisible world, where they would manipulate various groups from within as well.

There's also a lot of nonsense of course on the internet too, which can take you down conspiracy paths. I hate the term ‘conspiracy’ because the government wants us to use it like we're some sort of hobbyists, and some sort of kooks; I don't use the term. But that's become the most popular type of site now; the ‘conspiracy’ site, and there's many out there. There's professional agents out there as well, who have been funded by governments, and even launched by governments to be well known – especially in Europe – to lead the conspiracy sites. Then they bring in the UFOs, the aliens, until they have achieved their goal.

Counterintelligence – let's talk about counterintelligence and how it works. What is intelligence? Intelligence gathering is sending agents out to simply listen; they listen in market places, bars, cafés, as to what the people are discussing. Lawrence of Arabia, in his own book *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* [said he] was trained as an agent; he was trained in Aramaic, Arabic languages. He was given lots of money – he and eleven other people, trained from Cambridge – and sent over to the Arabic countries to start up Arabic newspapers. Once they started putting stories in the newspapers they went round the market places, they hired lots of guys to listen to gossip, to see if the intelligence they were putting out in the papers was being discussed by the recipients, the readers. That's basic intelligence gathering. What is counterintelligence? Counterintelligence, from a government's perspective, is taking information and data that could be crucial – it could be bad for the ruling regime – and finding ways to counter that knowledge; counter it.

What you do, standard-wise, if you can't defame the person who's bringing out a truth – or kill them – is to bring out your own heroes; launch them well, finance them well into the same area, saying the same stuff that others are talking about – it's called intelligence – giving out facts. And once they have the following, then they start bringing in aliens and UFOs, and they bring in the new age, the whole new age religion into it – spirituality is the big term they're using today – until a newcomer, a skeptic will hear this stuff from the paid agent (who's very good) who gives the same data as the person who doesn't go into the UFOs and so on. But the guy who doesn't go into the UFOs, aliens, reptilians and all the rest of it, suddenly is thrown out with the other guy; you're classified with them by association. Your topics are associated, even though you stay clear of the fantasy stuff – the disinformation – you'll be lumped along with them. And then they've countered the intelligence; when you mention the facts people laugh at you, say “oh you probably believe that the aliens are running the world now.” And that's it. That's counterintelligence, and that is also all over the internet. And it's paid for by, again, government psy-ops operations.

Some groups I've found are doing really good work, where people decide to get together, physically. And they will choose a book to read to do with the factual data that's available to the public that can be proven. And they'll go through it; they'll analyze the book, they'll analyze the phrases, they'll analyze the contents. They start to participate in what they're reading because others will remember this particular era, this time, when this event happened, can add to the thing and so on. That's participation, that's communication. And other information from those involved, who lived through things, can be added to the whole thing, giving you a much more complete picture. So it's a good idea to start this kind of thing off in your local area, even if it's only two of you that start it off. Don't sit and laugh – it's kind of comical at first when you say “we're going to discuss this book” and you've never done anything like this in your lifetime. Sit down and get yourself a coffee or a beer, or whatever you need, and take turns at reading. And ask the other guy, do you have anything to add to what I've just read? Do you have any insights into it? What do you think of this? It gets you stimulated into participating and really thinking, because everybody who's alive today has been trained literally not to have to think.

As Brzezinski said; shortly the public will be unable to reason or think for themselves – they'll expect the media to do their reasoning for them. So let's counter that. Let's get back to thinking for ourselves, using the data, the material; get involved, start using our minds again. And you'll be surprised – it's like a muscle that you haven't used for a long time – how quickly you start to use it, how sharp you become so quickly. And if you can get larger and larger groups together doing the same thing and then you can branch them together, communicate together, then they suggest other books that you haven't heard of – maybe you need a particular book for evidence. I have stacks of them at home.

Everyone has access somewhere to some material they've got stuck away, and when you start putting all of this material together, mainly through, as I said, discussion and reading groups, you can add to the knowledge. The more knowledge and facts, actual factual data you can put together, the bigger your arsenal is and the easier it becomes to show people and convince them: “Look, this is authenticated stuff. Here's the factual data, here's the physical book.” Read from that book and then have your discussions; what do you think about this? What do you think they meant by this? What do you think has happened? Have they fulfilled this part of an agenda? And most folk will say “yeah, they have.” Well here's how they did it.

The evidence is all there but knowledge, remember, is scattered. That's also why since the '70s and so on, televisions were put up in places where people used to communicate to each other; bars and restaurants, the pubs of Europe. Everyone talked and discussed everything. The televisions were all put in for a reason, and now everyone's mesmerized when you can hear sports or loud music; you can't communicate anymore. That was government promoted, because the government licensed the big chains of taverns and pubs all throughout Europe.

So what you've got really is a deliberate attempt - nothing happens for no reason. Why? The customers weren't demanding they were bored in bars as they discussed topics; people would just move around the pub talking and listening to the conversations and you'd join in the one that you liked. Why was it so important to destroy communication? It's because it's the main propaganda tool; it stops communication between people even in a room. If you notice too, they don't even discuss the topics once the news is read to them to each other. They've both been downloaded with the opinions. You don't have to ask what their opinion is; it's going to be the same one as you've been downloaded with, left by the expert.

So we've got to get back to communications, and communicating with each other, and finding the evidence. Knowledge is scattered; knowledge is power so it's scattered all over the place, in thousands of books. But when you can start these reading classes up and get other reading classes communicating with you even through the internet, you can start putting the data, the factual data together so that you can present it to the public, and bring in more and more members. Only knowledge, and the will to use this knowledge, is going to thwart the plans that have openly been made for us and declared by the elite at the top.

The whole problem of being involved in a community can be a double-edged sword. We know for instance that 'communitarianism' is a term used first by Bush senior, talking about the collectivistic society coming in. The United Nations has us all split up into communities; it's promoted through local TV. Even Sudbury here has "your community" - this is your local community, be involved in your community. They're talking about a politically correct community, that's the problem. Government really penetrated and altered and distorted and changed society through communities - not just with television, which has certainly destroyed the community spirit.

The intent of government - and this is how abusers work too; abusers work with the same technique, because they want power over a victim. The abuser will come in and take care, initially, of problems of the abused. Often the problems are the very outcome of what the abusers have been doing to the victims in the first place. Government came in with welfare for instance a long time ago, in all countries at about the same time. At one time families helped each other out. You didn't need welfare. If someone lost their job everyone chipped in. You didn't condemn the family member for being unemployed or ill or whatever, or losing their job. Families helped each other. The family, remember, is still really the smallest nucleus of a tribe. And then government came in with unemployment insurance - which they took off you, nothing was for free. And gradually over time, when people became unemployed or even sick for a while and couldn't work, I heard people even say to their own relatives "well go to welfare; that's what they're for. There are social agencies to deal with this." Until today we're in a sad state where even close relatives won't help each other out. They expect the government - the abuser; the government is the abuser - they expect the government to take care of all financial problems for the unfortunate victims, and they stop helping each other out.

We've got to start reclaiming the right to - and you can do it personally, with people you know - to help other people out and start countering the government's mandate, because the government's mandate is for control over the victims, not to help the victims. Those who fall under that particular level into the welfare state have their lives run by government agencies and social workers. That's what Huxley said; he said they won't need their survival capabilities - Russell said the same thing - because the government is taking care and making all their decisions for them. Not to help you, it's really to take you over and have you obeying them and their system.

That's what you're up against; a planned war strategy, making them dependent upon government services - not their family units, not their brothers and sisters, their fathers and mothers, but on the state itself. We've got to counter that and become involved again in the lives of those around us and have our own true communities. It doesn't matter if there's only five of you in a community, even if you live in a town or a city; that's your own little community, where you all have something in common. What it really is, is gaining knowledge for your own - and others' - self-preservation and survival into the future.

Transcribed by Seneca

Alan Watt: Shock And Awe - The Manipulation Of The Human Psyche - youtube links

Part 1 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7LL4M-HhXLs>

Part 2 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7XAUAWYp6-c>

Part 3 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZgPuSk3L0dE>

Part 4 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1HrKvWhY5o>

Other useful links

Military Use of Mind Control Weapons Judy Wall 1998

<http://www.whale.to/b/wall.html>

The Sound of Silence: The Antithesis of Freedom by A. True Ott, PhD, ND (Dec 12, 2008)

<http://educate-yourself.org/cn/soundsofsilence11dec08.shtml>

David Rockefeller speaks about population control.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ClqUcSwenn8>

Adam Curtis' The Century of the Self

Part 1 of 4 - Happiness Machines

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=9167657690296627941>

Part 2 of 4 - The Engineering of Consent

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=678466363224520614>

Part 3 of 4 - There is Policeman Inside all our Heads, He Must Be Destroyed

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=6401178873186559982>

Part 4 of 4 - Eight People Sipping Wine in Kettering

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=4282687027796578107>

Norman Dodd on Reece Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (Congressional Inquiry)

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-7373201783240489827>

Transcript - <http://www.supremelaw.org/authors/dodd/interview.htm>

Nov. 19, 2008

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" on RBN:

Class Arrogance and Darwinian Agenda

mp3 - http://cuttingthrough.jenknass.com/CTTM/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_198_Class_Arrogance_and_Darwinian_Agenda_Nov192008.mp3

transcript -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/transcripts/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_198_Class_Arrogance_and_Darwinian_Agenda_Nov192008.html

Nov. 20, 2008

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" on RBN:

Relationship of Scientific Dictatorship

mp3 - http://cuttingthrough.jenknass.com/CTTM/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_199_Relationship_of_Scientific_Dictatorship_Nov202008.mp3

transcript -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/transcripts/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_199_Relationship_of_Scientific_Dictatorship_Nov202008.html

Feb. 3, 2009

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" on RBN:

Plan is Said by Sir Charles Inbred

mp3 - http://cuttingthrough.jenknass.com/CTTM2009/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_248_Plan_is_Said_by_Sir_Charles_Inbred_Feb032009.mp3

transcript -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/transcripts/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_248_Plan_is_Said_by_Sir_Charles_Inbred_Feb032009.html

Feb. 4, 2009

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" on RBN:

Sir C. G. Darwin -- A Scion of Science

mp3 - http://cuttingthrough.jenknass.com/CTTM2009/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_249_Sir_CG_Darwin--A_Scion_of_Science_Feb042009.mp3

transcript - http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/transcripts/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_249_Sir_CG_Darwin--A_Scion_of_Science_Feb042009.html

Feb. 6, 2009

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" on RBN:

The Dream of Green will Make You Scream

mp3 -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.us/CTTM2009/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_251_The_Dream_of_Green_will_Make_You_Scream_Feb062009.mp3

transcript -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/transcripts/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_251_The_Dream_of_Green_will_Make_You_Scream_Feb062009.html

June 9, 2009

Alan Watt "Cutting Through The Matrix" on RBN

Hear the Drumming, Here it's Coming:

mp3 -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/CTTM2009/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_338_Hear_the_Drumming_Here_its_Coming_June092009.mp3

transcript -

http://www.cuttingthroughthematrix.com/transcripts/Alan_Watt_CTTM_LIVEonRBN_338_Hear_the_Drumming_Here_its_Coming_June092009.html

Your Brain Waves Change When You Watch TV -Low Alpha Waves Can Lead to "Mind Fog"

http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/247802/your_brain_waves_change_when_you_watch.html?cat=5

Are our heads in the cloud?

Everything under the sun — from our favourite books, films and music to our medical records — is moving online into 'the cloud'. It promises us greater freedom, but are we in danger of creating a huge electronic Big Brother?

http://technology.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/tech_and_web/the_web/article6740886.ece

Books

"The Scientific Outlook" by Bertrand Russell.

"The Next Million Years" by Charles Galton Darwin.

Alan's Materials Available for Purchase and Ordering Information:

- BOOKS

"Cutting Through"
Volumes 1, 2, 3

&

"Waiting for the Miracle....."
Also available in Spanish or Portuguese translation: "Esperando el Milagro....."
([Español](#)) & "Esperando um Milagre....." ([Português](#))
- CDS

Ancient Religions and
History MP3 CDs:
Part 1 (1998) and Part 2
(1998-2000)

&

Blurbs and 'Cutting Through the Matrix' Shows on MP3 CDs (Up to 50
Hours per Disc)
- DVDs

"Reality Check Part 1"

&

"Reality Check Part 2 - Wisdom, Esoterica and ...TIME"